## Rich People CP

### FW

**The value is Morality- off the resolution implies a moral obligation**

#### A. Util is the only moral system available to policymakers.

Goodin 95’ Robert E. Goodin 95 professor of government at the University of Essex, and professor of philosophy and social and political theory at Australian National University, “Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy”, Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and Public Policy, May 1995 HSLA//SC  
Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. **Public officials**, in contrast, **are** relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public **policy-makers** to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure that the payoff will do to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

#### Public policy-makers must look at the util first because they act on behalf of a collective body.

Woller 97’ Gary, Brigham Young University, “A Forum On The Role of Environmental Ethics in Restructuring Environmental Policy and Law for the Next Century”, Policy Currents, 1997 HSLA//SC

Moreover, virtually all public policies entail some redistribution of economic or political resources, such that one group's gains must come at another group's ex- pense. Consequently, public **policies** in a democracy **must be justified to the public**, and especially to those who pay the costs of those policies. Such justification cannot simply be assumed a priori by invoking some higher-order moral principle. Appeals to a priori moral principles, such as environmental preservation, also often fail to acknowledge that public policies inevitably entail trade-offs among competing values. **Thus** since policymakers cannot justify inherent value conflicts to the public in any philosophical sense, and since public policies inherently imply winners and losers, **the policymakers' duty to the public** interest **requires them to demonstrate that the** redistributive **effects** and value trade-offs **implied by their polices are** somehow **to the overall advantage of society.** At the same time, deontologically based ethical systems have severe practical limitations as a basis for public policy. At best, apriorimoral principles provide only general guidance to ethical dilemmas in public affairs and do not themselves suggest appropriate public policies, and at worst, they create a regimen of regulatory unreasonableness while failing to adequately address the problem or actually making it worse.For example, a moral obligation to preserve the environment by no means implies the best way, or any way for that matter, to do so, just as there is no a priori reason to believe that any policy that claims to preserve the environment will actually do so. Any number of policies might work, and others, although seemingly consistent with the moral principle, will fail utterly. That deontological principles are an inadequate basis for environmental policy is evident in the rather significant irony that most forms of deontologically based environmental laws and regulations tend to be implemented in a very utilitarian manner by street-level enforcement officials. Moreover, ignoring the relevant costs and benefits of environmental policy and their attendant incentive structures can, as alluded to above, actually work at cross purposes to environmental preservation. (There exists an extensive literature on this aspect of regulatory enforcement and the often perverse outcomes of regulatory policy. See, for example, Ackerman, 1981; Bartrip and Fenn, 1983; Hawkins, 1983, 1984; Hawkins and Thomas, 1984.) Even the most die-hard preservationist/deontologist would, I believe, be troubled by this outcome. The above points are perhaps best expressed by Richard Flathman, The number of values typically involved in public policy decisions, the broad categories which must be employed and above all, the scope and complexity of the consequences to be anticipated militate against reasoning so conclusively that they generate an imperative to institute a specific policy. It is seldom the case that only one policy will meet the criteria of the public interest (1958, p. 12). It **therefore** follows that in a democracy, **policymakers have an ethical duty to establish a** plausible link between **policy alternative**s and the problems they address, **and the public must be** reasonably **assured that a policy will actually do something about an existing problem**; this requires the means-end language and methodology of utilitarian ethics. Good intentions, lofty rhetoric, and moral piety are an insufficient though perhaps at times a necessary, basis for public policy in a democracy.

**Thus, the standard is Maximizing well-being**

### A: Text

#### The USFG ought to make National Service compulsory within the fields of Civilian and Military service only for people who are a part of the highest income bracket.

### B: N/B

**It’s Competitive- Although it’s possible to do the AFF, it would be undesirable.**

#### **1. National Service would end up benefiting the rich**

**Chapman 02’**,Bruce Chapman (director and founder of the Discovery Institute, an American think tank. He was previously a journalist, a Republican politician, and a diplomat), 9-1-2002, "A Bad Idea Whose Time is Past: The Case Against Universal Service," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/a-bad-idea-whose-time-is-past-the-case-against-universal-service/ //SW

**Universal service** likewise **would be an invitation to scandal**. The military draft was bad enough, dispatching the budding scientist to pick up paper on a base’s roadsides and sending the sickly malcontent to deliver meal trays to patients in base hospitals. **People with powerful parents got cushy positions**, while **the poor got the onerous tasks. When labor is both free and abundant, it will be squandered and abused.** If that was true in eras when mass armies were raised, what can one expect in a time when only a small fraction of the population is needed to operate our high-tech military?

#### **2.** The rich would coopt service and get more out of it

**Friedersdorf 13’**, Conor Friedersdorf (staff writer at The Atlantic, where he focuses on politics and national affairs. He lives in Venice, California, and is the founding editor of The Best of Journalism, a newsletter devoted to exceptional nonfiction), 6-26-2013, "The Case Against Universal National Service," Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/06/the-case-against-universal-national-service/277230/ //SW

Of course, a cosmopolitan, coastal elite like myself would think that a year abroad is more valuable for young people than a year of service. And guess what? While my particular brand of policy preferences might not be captured in **national service**, make no mistake that the rules **will be co-opted by ruling class elites to serve their ends. Everyone will be forced to serve, but some will serve in ways that reward them personally** more than others. **The system will be gamed** by the wealthy, the well-connected, the **folks with the social capital to figure out how things work** -- and national service will be set up in a way that serves their ends and reflects their values and preferences.

### C: Solvency

#### Only Elites get drafted- solves the Aff and prevents inequality

**Ackerman** **15’** Elliot Ackerman served five tours in Iraq and Afghanistan and is the recipient of the Silver Star, the Bronze Star for Valor, and the Purple Heart.

“Draft the Rich.” Time, Time, 11 Mar. 2015, time.com/3739513/a-modest-proposal-draft-the-rich/.

Each war the United States has fought has had its own construct: the national mobilization of the Second World War; [the 1.7 million draftees of the Vietnam War](http://www.nationalvietnamveteransfoundation.org/statistics.htm); and, over the last 14 years, the post-9/11 Wars have been fought with an all-volunteer force at a [cost approaching $6 trillion](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/9961877/Cost-to-US-of-Iraq-and-Afghan-wars-could-hit-6-trillion.html), primarily financed through deficit spending, with no significant taxes levied on the populace. This construct has come with a price: in its wake **we’ve been left with the most significant civil-military divide in our history.** In the past, waging war has been torturous for Americans, and rightfully so. The Civil War, World War I, World War II, and Vietnam were all grueling experiences, endeavors felt both economically and socially, as hundreds of thousands of lives were interrupted, or cut short, in order to fight. Even the “good wars”—like the Civil War and World War II—became difficult to sustain politically at such a cost of blood and treasure. **Today’s wars, fought** in the name of a **largely disengaged citizenry**, place our nation in a position of moral hazard. This dynamic was recently brought home to me when a friend and former Marine officer lamented how he’s been asked with surprising frequency if he had killed anyone in Iraq. Having been asked the same question a half-dozen times, his response resonated with me: “If I did, you paid me to do it.” So how do we structure things so that wars waged on behalf of all Americans aren’t experienced by the slimmest segment of the population? We could reinstate the draft, but this is overly simplistic. Vietnam taught us that unless the country is engaged in total war, a **national draft is a failed model.** With student deferments and **various loopholes** most often exclusively **leveraged** by **the well-off**, or influential, the brunt of that **conflict fell to** America’s **poorest, most marginalized citizens**, creating a toxic social rift. Also, the effectiveness of our all-volunteer force should not be compromised. So what construct exists where America maintains an effective fighting force while our citizenry becomes more conscious of its wars, steering us clear of future fourteen-year conflicts? What **I propose is a partial draft**—five percent of the [1.4 million service members on active duty](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_number_of_military_and_paramilitary_personnel), approximately 70,000 **troops, to be conscripted** for a half enlistment of two years through a lottery system pooled **exclusively from** sons and daughters of **households falling within the highest tax bracket.** Keeping the percentage of conscripts low will maintain the efficacy of the all-volunteer force, and **limiting** the draft **to** the **children of the wealthiest** and most influential **Americans will stymie a tolerance for** perpetual **war on** the part of **critical decision makers.** I would propose that draftees be assigned exclusively within the fields of combat arms: infantry, tanks, artillery, engineers, career paths which by and large have been opened up recently to women, and would ensure that no undue influence could be leveraged to secure work in areas far from actual fighting. Lower and middle class Americans will continue to join the military for educational opportunities, but with well-to-do citizens serving in greater numbers we would create an all-volunteer force which more accurately represents America.

#### The working class already enlist at a disproportional rate- the CP equalizes representation

**Lutz 08’** Lutz, Amy. “Who Joins the Military?: A Look at Race, Class, and Immigration Status.”Syracuse University SURFACE, Syracuse University, 2008, surface.syr.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=soc.

An important predictor to military service in the general population is family income. **Those with lower** family **income are more likely to join the military** than those with higher family income. **Thus the military may** indeed **be a career option** for those **for whom there are few** better **opportunities.** For such enlistees, military service can open opportunities that would not otherwise be available. Indeed, research has found that military service often serves as a positive turning point in the career trajectories of enlistees from disadvantaged circumstances (Elder 1986, 1987; Sampson and Laub 1996). A popular claim is that those of **low socioeconomic status are more likely to be assigned to combat roles** within the military than those from higher socioeconomic backgrounds. Based on this, it is said that **the poor serve as ―cannon fodder** in fighting for Who Joins the Military? 185 their nation during times of war. Gimbel and Booth (1996) have found that during the Vietnam War those with lower AFQT scores were more likely to be assigned to combat arms and to go to Vietnam, but they did not examine the impact of socioeconomic status. Thus, further research might investigate whether socioeconomic status is significantly related to one‘s assignment once one is accepted into the military. In conclusion, among race, socioeconomic status, and immigration status, **socioeconomic status is the only significant predictor** of having ever **served in the military**. Class differences in military enlistment likely reflect differences in the non-military occupational opportunity, structured along class lines. This research shows that **the all-volunteer force continues to see overrepresentation of the working and middle class**es, with fewer incentives for upper class participation.

### 